Case 5:08-cr-00144-JW Document 78 Filed 08/25/09 Page 1 of 4

1 2 3 4 5	BARRY J. PORTMAN Federal Public Defender LARA S. VINNARD Assistant Federal Public Defender 160 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 575 San Jose, CA 95113 Telephone: (408) 291-7753 Counsel for Defendant MACPHERSON		
6			
7			
8			
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
11		N. GD 00 00144 02 WV	
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No.: CR 08-00144-03 JW	
13	Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE HEARING AS TO HEIDI	
14	v.)	MACPHERSON AND EXCLUDE TIME; [PROPERTIES] ORDER	
15	HEIDI MACPHERSON, aka Heidi Pfeiffer,)		
16	Defendant.		
17			
18	Defendant and the government, through	their respective counsel, hereby stipulate that,	
19	subject to the Court's approval, the pretrial conference hearing in the above-captioned matter,		
20	presently scheduled for Monday, August 31, 2009, at 1:30 p.m., be vacated, and the matter set for		
21	change of plea and sentencing on Monday, September 21, 2009, at 1:30 p.m. The parties have		
22	reached agreement in principle to settle the case, and the continuance is requested to allow time		
23	for specific terms of a plea agreement to be addressed. Additionally, defense counsel requires		
24	time to review a proposed plea agreement with Ms. Pfeiffer. The selected date of September 21,		
25	2009 is the first Monday after August 31 on which all parties are available.		
26	///		
	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE HEARING DATE; [PROPOSED] ORDER	1	

Case 5:08-cr-00144-JW Document 78 Filed 08/25/09 Page 2 of 4

1	The parties further agree that time should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act because		
2	the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the interest of the		
3	public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would		
4	deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the		
5	exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The parties therefore		
6	stipulate that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and		
7	(B)(iv).		
8	Dated: 8/21/09	/s/	
9		LARA S. VINNARD Assistant Federal Public Defender	
10	Dated: 8/24/09	/s/	
11		JEFF NEDROW Assistant United States Attorney	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

STIPULATION TO CONTINUE HEARING DATE; [PROPOSED] ORDER No. CR 08-00144-03 JW

	Case 5:08-cr-00144-JW Document 78	Filed 08/25/09 Page 3 of 4		
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION			
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No.: CR 09-00144-03 JW		
12	Plaintiff,	[PROPUSED] ORDER CONTINUING HEARING AND EXCLUDING TIME		
13	v.)	ALIMING IN DERELEDING TIME		
14	HEIDI MACPHERSON, aka Heidi Pfeiffer,			
15	Defendant.			
16				
17	The parties have jointly requested a cont	inuance of the hearing set for Monday, August		
18	31, 2009, to allow time for the parties to finalize terms of a settlement agreement, and for Ms.			
19	Pfeiffer and her counsel to review the plea agreement once prepared. Additionally, time is			
20	needed for continuity of counsel.			
21	GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing date			
22	presently set for Monday, August 31, 2009, be continued to Monday, September 21, 2009, at			
23	1:30 p.m.			
24	Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the period of time			
25	from August 31, 2009 to September 21, 2009, shall be excluded from the period of time within			
26	which trial must commence under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161 et seq. The Court			
	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE HEARING DATE; [PROPOSED] ORDER No. CR 08-00144-03 IW	3		

Case 5:08-cr-00144-JW Document 78 Filed 08/25/09 Page 4 of 4

1	finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the			
2	requested continuance outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.			
3	The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time			
4	necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would			
5	result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time			
6	should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).			
7	The Court further VACATES the previously set trial dates.			
8	Dated: August 25, 2009			
9	JAMES WARE United States District Judge			
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				